DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 231 220 FL 013 778

AUTHOR Tucker, G. Richard; And Others
TITLE Exploring Strategies for Developing a Cohesive National Direction toward Language Education in the United States.
INSTITUTION InterAmerica Research Associates, Rosslyn, Va.; National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, Arlington, Va.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.; Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 83
CONTRACT NIE-400-80-0040
NOTE 38p.; Collection of papers presented at the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education seminar (Washington, DC, June 1982).
AVAILABLE FROM National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1555 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 605, Rosslyn, VA 22209 ($3.90).
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Activism; *Bilingual Education; *Bilingualism; *Cultural Pluralism; *Educational Policy; *Language Planning; Professional Associations; Public Relations; *Second Language Programs; Sociocultural Patterns; Socioeconomic Influences

ABSTRACT

The papers focus on the desirability, feasibility, and importance of proposing and beginning to implement a language agenda for all residents of the United States. After an introductory synthesis by G. R. Tucker, the following papers are presented: (1) "Matching Appropriate Solutions to Specific Linguistic Inadequacies" by R. E. Thompson; (2) "An Unprecedented Act of Fusion," by R. I. Brod; (3) "An Insomniac's Solution to the Problem of National Language Policy," by J. Levy; (4) "Consolidating Mutual Strengths," by V. da Mota; and (5) "The Role of Language Study in Bilingual Education," by J. E. Alatis. The following themes are developed: (1) the need to examine the personal, economic and social factors that affect the learning and use of language in diverse settings; (2) the need to change public attitudes toward promotion of bilingualism, language study, and public policy in the domain of bilingual education and second language learning; (3) the need to conduct a public awareness or consciousness-raising campaign; (4) the necessity of cooperation and collaboration among the various professional organizations; and (5) the need for all to become activists at the local level. (AMH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED231220

Exploring Strategies for Developing a Cohesive National Direction Toward Language Education in the United States

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NCBE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FL 013 778

National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education

This document is published by InterAmerica Research Associates, Inc., pursuant to contract NIE 400-80-0040 to operate the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. The National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education is jointly funded by the National Institute of Education and the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, U.S. Department of Education. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express their judgment freely in professional and technical matters; the views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the sponsoring agencies.

InterAmerica Research Associates, Inc., d/b/a
National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education
1555 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 605
Rosslyn, Virginia 22209
(703) 522-0710/(800) 336-4560

First printing 1983
Printed in USA

Foreword

This collection of papers is drawn from the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education seminar, "Exploring Strategies for Developing a Cohesive National Direction Toward Language Education in the United States" held in June 1982. It marked the culmination of the Clearinghouse's 1981-82 seminar series on Current Issues in Bilingual Education.

All the seminars were held in Washington, D.C. on Capitol Hill. It was felt that the location of the sessions was indicative of the relevance the discussions had to real policy issues facing the United States. Among the speakers at earlier forums were the eminent Finnish researcher Tove Skutnabb-Kangas; Jesse Soriano, director of the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs; and Protase Woodford of the Educational Testing Service.

The publication of this collection of papers is designed to contribute to the continuing debate and discussion throughout the country regarding the proper response to the growing need for second language competency. How the education system in the United States might meet this challenge--both for native-English-speaking students and for non-English-speaking students--is the underlying theme of each paper.

One of the activities of the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education is to publish documents addressing the specific information needs of the bilingual education community. We are proud to add this distinguished publication to our growing list of titles. Subsequent Clearinghouse products will similarly seek to contribute information that can assist in the education of minority culture and language groups in the United States.

National Clearinghouse
for Bilingual Education

Table of Contents

Chapter		Page
I.	Integrative Remarks, G. Richard Tucker	1
II.	Matching Appropriate Actions to Specific Linguistic Inadequacies, Richard E. Thompson	6
III.	An Unprecedented Act of Fusion, Richard I. Brod	11
IV.	An Insomniac's Solution to the Problem of National Language Policy, Jack Levy	18
V.	Consolidating Mutual Strengths, Virginia da Mota	23
VI.	The Role of Language Study in Bilingual Education, James E. Alatis	28

I. Integrative Remarks

G. Richard Tucker
Center for Applied Linguistics

The papers presented in this monograph formed the basis for oral remarks and subsequent discussion at a colloquium convened by the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, to discuss diverse approaches to developing a comprehensive and cohesive national movement to promote enhanced language education throughout the United States. Discussants took as their starting point the desirability of developing a language-competent society. There is a consensus in all the papers, as indeed there was in the discussion at the colloquium, that all residents of the United States should have an opportunity to develop the highest possible degree of proficiency in understanding, speaking, reading, and writing English whether it is their mother tongue or a second language. Furthermore, native English speakers should have an opportunity to develop an ability to understand, speak, read, and write a second language; while those whose first language is other than English should have an opportunity to develop proficiency in the first language. It was felt that the development of a language-competent society should be accorded the highest educational priority. To achieve this goal necessitates transcending rivalries and disagreements that may exist among representatives of the various professional organizations. It requires the development of a joint "language agenda" toward which all--students, parents, teachers, prospective employers--can work effectively.

In the brief remarks to follow, I shall identify salient issues which characterized the core of the oral presentations and which also appear as common threads woven throughout the papers. As mentioned, the papers and discussion focused on the desirability, the feasibility, and the importance of proposing and beginning to implement a language agenda for all residents of the United States. Much of the discussion dwelt on underlying policy issues: the need for understanding the context in which languages would be required or used; the need for attitude change; the need for "grass roots" support for the implementation of a language agenda; the need for professional unity and cooperation; and the need for activism.

Needs Assessment

The issues related to development of a language agenda are brought into sharp relief by the rapid influx of refugees to the United States, the continuing acceptance of large numbers of entrants and immigrants, the flow of undocumented aliens, and the increasing number of native-born limited- or non-English-speaking residents. The needs of this diverse clientele must be clearly understood so that language policies can be developed that are as responsive as possible to the needs of both prospective consumers and society.

The first major theme woven throughout a number of papers (see particularly those by Thompson, Brod, and Levy) was the need to examine the constellation of personal, economic, and social factors that affect the learning and use of language(s) in diverse settings. What are the personal and societal consequences of encouraging the development of a bilingual citizenry? For what purposes do language skills need to be acquired? What skills are essential? Are there preferred strategies for facilitating second language learning? The point was made repeatedly that language educators must understand and clarify the rather complex needs surrounding these issues. Thompson, for example, draws our attention to a study commissioned by the Carnegie Corporation of New York many years ago that identified clearly the need for a high degree of proficiency in reading foreign languages on the part of U.S. residents.

Fifty years ago, the need for reading proficiency--as opposed to oral proficiency--was perfectly understandable and appropriate; but in an increasingly interdependent world, this goal is both simplistic and inappropriate to contemporary needs. There was a consensus among the discussants and the audience about the need to clarify the distinction between language study for humanistic purposes and language study for a variety of well-defined specific communicative purposes (see particularly Alatis and Brod). The need to distinguish between the inherent humanistic value of language study, with its accompanying awareness of cultural diversity, and the "opportunity loss" associated with an inability to do business in the language of the buyer must be debated and clarified.

All agreed that there was a need to apply insights from the discipline of language policy research to these questions (e.g., Rubin, 1979; Rubin and Jernudd, 1979). The participants expressed unanimous hope that the National Center for Bilingual Research (NCBR) would work diligently to implement its language policy research mandate--one of three crucial foci of NCBR.

Attitude Change

The second major theme running through the papers and discussion concerned the need to encourage changes in attitude. This issue had several dimensions: How can the promotion of bilingualism be seen as encouraging the development of a national resource? How can bilingual education programs be seen as providing or enriching a superior education rather than as compensatory education? How can the inclusion of second-language teaching programs come to be viewed as part of the basic or core curriculum rather than as "frill" subjects? DaMota, in particular, decried the seemingly popular stereotype that the encouragement of personal and societal bilingualism will enveitably yield dire consequences.

A great deal of discussion explored the view that second language learning and teaching possesses inherent humanistic value with traditional liberalizing or mind-expanding functions that can have positive personal as well as societal repercussions.

There was a recurrent discussion of the need to change the public conception of language study. Indeed, the point was made repeatedly that the encouragement of second language teaching and bilingualism need not result in ethnic separation in the southwestern United States, for example, in the way that alarmists claim has occurred within Canada in the province of Quebec. The major point, often overlooked, is that there has been a serious attempt during the past decade to encourage the development of societal bilingualism within the province of Quebec specifically to lessen the probability of separation rather than to enhance it. A great deal of colloquium discussion concerned the fact that a policy has yet to be identified that would encourage or promote the use of second languages within the public school system. DaMota forcefully argued that we must identify the critics of second language teaching, understand their arguments, and be able to address their concerns. At the same time, we must take steps to ensure that the task of learning a second language is seen as desirable and appealing. At various points, the inherent advantages of offering content instruction in a particular target language rather than relying solely upon the teaching of the language per se was discussed. The importance of encouraging "additive" rather than "subtractive" bilingualism was reiterated (Lambert et al., 1981).

Need to Improve Grass-Roots Communications

The need to conduct a public awareness or consciousness-raising campaign led to a discussion of ways

to improve grass-roots communications. At the colloquium, as in many similar activities within the past few years, many participants had the feeling that this was a group of specialists talking to themselves. Every speaker and numerous members of the audience emphasized that it was absolutely essential to convey our enthusiasm and our collective message about the advantages of bilingualism to local PTAs, boards of trade, the business sector, and local mass media outlets. Discussion focused on the need to conduct a major public information campaign. It was seen as ironic by many that at a time when a number of major home or personal computer makers are attempting to tantalize the public by announcing the applicability of their computers to foreign language study that the language profession is not atttempting to use mass media for its own purposes.

Professional Unity

This discussion led directly to a consideration of the need for unity among professional organizatons concerned with foreign and second language teaching. There was healthy debate about the respective priorities of the various organizations, mention of lack of organizational unity in the past, and expression of a firm resolve to work together in the future. Although it may seem relatively trite to conclude that everyone has agreed to work together and will likely do so, there are signs that the profession(s) is beginning to recognize the necessity to work toward the implementation of a common language agenda.

Specifically, organizations such as the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), the National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE), and Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)--together with a variety of others--have joined together in an umbrella organization, the Joint National Committee for Languages (JNCL). These organizations have agreed to cooperate to influence legislation, policy formation, regulation writing, certification development, etc., and to raise the level of public awareness about the importance of language in U.S. life. In addition, organizations are beginning to realize this necessity for a common, concerted effort; it is not at all unusual to find that the most recent issue of the TESOL Newsletter contains a front-page article by Ramon Santiago, past president of NABE, or to see that NABE chose "Bilingualism: In the National Interest" as the theme of its 1983 annual meeting. It was agreed that organizations need to work to achieve their own specific goals and priorities within a more general guiding framework. All saw the desirability of enhancing communication among bilingual educators, ESL teachers, foreign language teachers, and other members of

the profession--from classroom teacher to the curriculum coordinator to the university-based researcher, in addition to the leadership of the various professional organizations.

Professionals as Activists

The colloquium concluded with a discussion of the need for all to become activists at the local level (see particularly Levy). It was argued that members of the profession have for too long been reactive--responding slowly and at times uncertainly to decisions that threaten enrollments or question budgetary allocations -- and only recently have begun to perceive the need to take a more proactive approach. We need to develop a common agenda and to work aggressively toward the implementaion of that agenda.

This agenda must take as its highest priority the goal of developing a language-competent U.S. society. The ability to understand, speak, read, and write English and at least one other language constitutes one of the most priceless attributes we can offer to members of society--an attribute that will prove to be rewarding personally and for society in general in the decade ahead.

References

Lambert, W.E., et al. Faces and Facets of Bilingualism. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics/National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1981.

Rubin, J. Directory of Language Planning Organizations. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1979.

Rubin, J., and Jernudd, B.H. References for Students of Language Planning. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1979.

II. Matching Appropriate Actions to Specific Linguistic Inadequacies

Richard E. Thompson
U.S. Department of Education

During the early years of public education in the United States, secondary schools existed almost exclusively to prepare a relatively small number of young men to enter the university. The institutions of higher education regarded a reading knowledge of classical and modern languages to be the hallmark of an educated man. High schools directed their preparatory work toward that end.

In the 1920s, the Carnegie Corporation financed a study of the appropriate role of foreign language study in the United States. It was not surprising that the final report concluded that the only attainable objective in public secondary schools was reading, and this became our national policy.

Things were more simple then.

At the turn of the century some fifty or so nation-states were generally recognized. Today there are about 150, representing peoples and cultures that we somewhat ethnocentrically refer to as "non-Western." Intersecting this political expansion was a virtual explosion of technological and scientific innovation. A gradual blurring of previously clear demarcations between domestic and foreign issues or problems has placed us in the process of outgrowing yet one more national frontier -- the boundary that separated domestic from foreign policy (1).

> The United States is typified by a highly sophisticated and complex network of international relations; a country which has bilateral and multilateral interlocking treaties with almost every nation of the world -- military, political and cultural -- and with all the responsibilities and obligations this entails; with an economy deeply linked with the balance of world trade; and with a restless pluralistic society facing an identity crisis from within -- to melt or not to melt -- and from without the challenge to live in an increasingly interactive and inter-affective world (2).

In "The Approach to Language Planning within the

United States,"(3) Rubin described two kinds of linguistic inadequacies:

1. Those that are mainly focused on language form or use and include

- a need for standardization of all aspects of language
- a need to use English well and correctly
- a need to know foreign languages

2. Those that appear to be more directly related to or motivated by socio-political or economic considerations and include

- limited English is related to poverty and school performance
- failure to acquire basic skills is related to poor employment opportunities, participation in democracy, and poor citizenship
- lack of foreign language knowledge retards our national leadership position
- translation of foreign science material is needed
- maintenance of home language is needed to promote cultural identity retention
- use of specialized professional jargon prevents access to information or accomplishment of particular tasks.

How simple, by contrast, the earlier solution to stress the acquisition of reading skills now seems; and we have made only rough beginning approximations toward solutions for some of the complex and interrelated mix of linguistic inadequacies we face today -- to wit, bilingual education and the modern foreign language classroom.

A report on foreign language teaching in the schools prepared for the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies contains the following characterization:

> ...foreign language instruction today is better than it has ever been before in the history of the United States. It is directed to more comprehensive objectives -- all four, (speaking, listening, reading, writing) plus culture. Because we know better how to teach a wider range of student ability, we can be successful with a more comprehensive population (4).

The report, which provides a description of what a good foreign language class looks like, places major emphasis on what can be called procedural matters, i.e., foreign language teaching methodology.

In the case of the bilingual education classroom, a variety of approaches also obtain, and descriptions of what a good bilingual education class looks like can be provided.

In our exploration of strategies it is a appealing to align these two widespread national processes and speculate on areas where possible corrections to the linguistic inadequacies which underlie the problems converge. Let me provide three examples:

- Bilingual education programs which maintain and enhance the native language competence of the limited English speaker and develop foreign language skills of the English speaker in the same classroom can be viewed as helping to offset the problem of dropping enrollment in the foreign language classrooms.
- Graduates of bilingual education schools whose home language and culture represent an important national resource could be better utilized in the foreign language classroom to provide authenticity of language and real language practice not readily available in many parts of the country.
- Lengthening the bilingual education schooling through high school, at least in selected languages, could help offset the need for initial specialist training in foreign language and area studies at the postsecondary and postgraduate levels.

The difficulty with such suggestions is that they are too generalized. The sheer complexity of what we need to conduct the multilingual business of an interdependent world will require more specialization -- not generalization -- of treatment in the classroom and much more emphasis on content than procedure.

The most effective classroom, whether it be in a program of foreign language education or bilingual education is one that has matched appropriate corrective actions to specific linguistic inadequecies.

In order to improve our approach to the solution of language problems, we need to have current in-depth knowledge of the scope of the problem. In the case of bilingual education it has been suggested that a variety of factors complicate the use of appropriate remedies: for example, the movement away from the melting-pot theory of assimilation toward the concept of cultural pluralism; the rediscovery of poverty in the United States in the 1960s; and recognition of the denial of legal rights to minority groups in such areas as education, voting, citizenship and

economic life. Other factors relate to the existence of functional definitions of limited English proficiency and their applications to varying types of target populations, as well as to attitudes of teachers, parents, and society at large.

In the case of foreign language education we need rather specific knowledge on need, attitude, and motivation. How many persons need how much, of which language, when, and for what purposes?

Having been sufficiently unsuccessful in identifying the separate linguistic inadequacies in the areas of foreign language and bilingual education and providing adequate solutions, we are justified, therefore, in suggesting great caution in developing combinative strategies for joint solutions.

I am not suggesting that we avoid seeking such strategies, I am rather suggesting that we approach the problem from a language planning research basis.

Joshua Fishman has recently noted that:

> Language planning research has, increasingly, been studying language planning practice, i.e., decision-making in connection with language problems. However, the practitioners of language planning (legislators, implementors of policy, government agencies and language academy personnel, language specialists in private industry, etc.) have not yet turned to or utilized language planning research to any major degree as a guide to their own procedures.(5)

In conclusion, the approach of the United States to its linguistic inadequacies falls far short of any planning model. It could be considerably improved by a clearer statement of problems and a more coordinated treatment. We need to identify a framework within which planning agencies, organizations, national, state, and local governments, and individuals may cooperatively develop a comprehensive and clearly enunciated national language planning effort.

The President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies had the opportunity to put in place such an effort. The National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies, an outgrowth of the President's Commission, is providing some planning activities for a part of the national problem. Perhaps out of meetings such as this one can come further refinements and a better understanding of how we structure our explorations on sound national language planning research principles. Or will

decisions affecting language education in the United States continue to respond to political events -- internal in the case of bilingual education and external in the case of foreign language education?

Notes

1. For a fuller discussion, see Robert Ward's "National Needs for International Education." (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, February 1977).

2. Richard T. Thompson, "The Future of Language Study in the United States," Language in American Life, edited by Gerli, Alatis, and Brod (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1978, p.118).

3. A paper originally presented at the International Association of Applied Linguistics (AILA) Congress, Montreal, Canada, August 21-26, 1978.

4. Helen Warriner, "Foreign Language Teaching in the Schools -- 1979 -- Focus on Methodology," President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979, p. 51).

5. Joshua Fishman, "Language Planning and Language Planning Research: The State of the Art," in: Advances in Language Planning, edited by Joshua Fishman. (The Hague: Mouton, 1974, p.15).

III. An Unprecedented Act of Fusion

Richard I. Brod
Modern Language Association

For foreign (or second) language education in the United States, the concept of a national direction presupposes some kind of national purpose, national need, or national mandate that is at best elusive of definition, at worst mere wishful thinking on the part of the interest group most directly concerned -- language educators (1). Compounding the problem is a persistent confusion of purpose that pervades many discussions of foreign language education in particular: a confusion between its humanistic functiooon in general liberal arts education and its practical function in training fluent users of a language. While the two functions can and do overlap, they nevertheless require very different kinds of commitment on the part of the learner and very different kinds of instructional programs.

As far as general education curriculuum is concerned, the concept of a national need or mandate for any specific area of study seems to be at odds with the U.S. traditions of local control and individual choice. Even in the case of the so-called "basic" skills--verbal, mathematical, and motor--there is no national consensus and certainly nothing like a national curriculum, although something as uncontroversial as the improvement of physical fitness can manage to receive the support of a President's council and thus come close to being a kind of patriotic mandate. On a lower level of priority, concern about declining levels of skill in reading, writing , and mathematics has produced a broad consensus of interest, but nothing like a national program (2).

Given the persistence of tradition, and the diversity of interests and popular causes in the United States, the likelihood that second-language study could ever become universally--i.e., nationally--accepted as one of the "basics" of education seems remote. Yet the idea is one that deserves further discussion among language educators and their allies, since it can help us clarify our own thinking about the general-education value of language study. In my view, the candidacy of second-language study for a place in the canon of general education should be based on four principal learning outcomes that can beclaimed for it. First, it leads students to the

attainment of a measurable degree of competence in the understanding and use of a specific second language. Second, it teaches an awareness of language--its universals and its particulars, as manifested in a conscious and detailed comparison between a student's first or native language and his or her newly acquired language. Third, it teaches facts and generalizations about the culture(s) of the nations where a given target language is spoken, helps students understand the relationships between language and culture, and affords opportunities for contrasting the target culture with that of the United States. Fourth, it imparts an awareness of culture as a universal phenomenon, brings students to understand the concept of cultural parity, which in turn is a link to the study of racial, ethnic, and linguistic diversity in U.S. society, as well as globally. Defined by these four aspects, language study can legitimately be regarded as both a core discipline of the humanities and the keystone of something that might be called "global civics": the education necessary for responsible citizenship in an interdependent, interactive world. So defined, language study can legitimately be regarded as one of the essentials of general education and therefore a national priority and a matter of national concern.

In its training function, language study has been regarded for some time as a national concern. Clearly, it was so regarded by the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Education in its report (1979); by the National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies; and by other groups--including members of the language teaching profession itself--who have adduced evidence and testimonials concerning the needs of various segments of society for language skills (Wilkins, 1977; Inman, 1978; Muller, 1981). Demonstration of public need for languages has always been an elusive goal, and the evidence compiled for it so far is interesting but far from overwhelming. The needs of the military, diplomacy, and other branches of government can be defined on the basis of internal agency studies and policy statements; the needs of business can be measured indirectly through local surveyys, comparisons of volume of newspaper advertising for bilingual personnel, enrollments in adult language courses and proprietary schools, and similar sources; the needs of the professions (e.g., medicine) can be at least partially documented by examining bibliographies of research reports written in languages other than English. Though still inconclusive, the evidence is strong enough to be taken seriously by those concerned with the future of our national economy. What cannot be documented, however, particularly with respect to business and industry, are the opportunities that are lost and potential that is unfulfilled because of insufficient language skills. This loss is indeed a serious problem and

one that is likely to grow more serious as the nation's economic independence diminishes. But it too amorphous and intangible to be cited as the basis of national--or even local--policy in education.

Another problem with the argument for second language study to meet national needs is the fact that our national tradition in education, particularly in higher education, involves freedom of choice as well as equality of access. While in a general way our educational system can certainly be regarded as being in the service of the nation, it emphatically does not conscript students for specific public missions. Even if it were possible to define a national purpose, mandate, or need for second language skills, we have no device for translating that need into enrollments of individual students in high school or college. I would argue that since this need is not part of general education, it may not be appropriate to seek to meet it in the regular educational system in any case. The history of the Army Specialized Training Programs of the World War II era, and the Foreign Service Institute and other government language schools, shows that the teaching of language skills to meet national needs is most efficiently and effectively accomplished in ad hoc intensive programs, not as part of general education. Strictly speaking, such teaching is not education at all, but job training--something pursued by adults as part of their working careers after completion of preparatory education. While a limited number of students may be able to get a good start on such skill training as part of their general education, the majority will not and cannot be expected to do so. If, however, students can attain the four outcomes cited above as part of their secondary school and college preparation, they will have an adequate start toward eventual functional competency in a language.

We should continue to insist on the distinction between the purposes and desired outcomes of language study in general education on the one hand, and those of specialized training on the other. The distinction is essential, because it is fundamental to the program of reform and reorientation that the language teaching profession--including the bilingual education profession--must now begin to undertake. The principal goal of this reform will be the achievement of accountability and credibility among the public, including all past, present, and potential "consumers" of language education. The distinction between general and specialized education must be clearly understood before any statement can be made concerning what is desirable in language study. Once that is articulated, attention can be directed toward defining what can be achieved, particularly with respect to language skills, for both general and specific purposes.

One of the most encouraging results of the work of the President's Commission of 1978-79 was the beginning of a growing movement by language professionals toward the establishment of proficiency standards for language study. As it happens, the work of the commission was not the only source of this impulse. The widespread erosion of college and university foreign language requirements, starting in 1968, not only damaged the enrollment base of many college-level language departments, but it also compelled faculty to recognize the extent of their dependence on such requirements. At the same time, a message from past "consumers" of language instruction was also being heard. As the profession became aware of the gross disparity in quality and effectiveness among the thousands of school and college language programs in the nation, it began to realize that a lack of standards was a principal cause of public disaffection, and that phrases like "two years' study" or "sixteen credits" had no meaning with respect to the attainment of functional language skills. By the late 1970s, the language teaching profession had moved toward a consensus on the need for defining stages of achievement and levels of competence.

Making use of oral interview techniques and standards used successfully by the Foreign Service Institute, the profession has begun to move slowly toward a definition of skills, and toward a consensus concerning levels that can be achieved under standard conditions. Following the leadership of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, specialists in the field have begun to flesh out definitions of generic and language-specific goals in the four language skills and in culture. When complete, this work will serve as a foundation for the development of curricula, examinations, syllabi, and teacher training programs. The result will be greater clarity about the proficiencies of both students and teachers--for their own benefit and for the benefit of those who will employ them and draw upon their skills. The project has as its ultimate goals the restoration of credibility to language instruction, increased public respect, a growing awareness of the value and usefulness of language competence, and a more accurate perception, by students and by the public at large, of the time and effort needed to achieve functional proficiency.

No one doubts that definitions of skills, competencies, and standards can be achieved. What remains uncertain is the depth of consensus that will support them and the level of professional and public acceptance they can win. The language teaching profession is notoriously fragmented, not only by language and level, but also by ideology and quality of preparation. The natural diversity of language teachers is further compounded by the wide variation among the types of institutions where they are

employed, with a corresponding variation of educational mission and organization. In short, a profession that desperately needs standardization is operating under conditions that prevent it from taking hold.

To achieve consensus, the language teaching profession will need to expend considerable energy in an unprecendented act of fusion. At the same time, it will need to rally its forces (and alliances) in a massive campaign to raise the consciousness of the public. These are separate tasks, but it is essential that they be synchronized, coordinated, and led by a single agent of change: the profession itself, however it may be defined. While support may be forthcoming from various allies and benign agencies, the lesson of U.S. history and contemporary society is, surely, that leadership does not come from "outsiders"--and certainly not from the federal government or any other central authority--but from the vested interests.

In the case of the language-teaching profession, its naturally fragmented state has long discouraged unity and inhibited leadership. In recent years the field was able to achieve a higher level of unity and energy only when public attention was focused on it, as in 1958, when the National Defense Education Act was passed, and to a lesser degree in 1978-79, with the President's Commission. Otherwise, the field has tended to behave passively. The fragmentation of the language profession is something that will not be overcome easily. Indeed, experience leads one to question whether any leadership group--such as an association--can succeed in unifying such disparate interests as those of French literary criticism, Southeast Asian studies, English as a second language, bilingual education, and the classics. Even a loose coalition like the Joint National Committee for Languages (JNCL) can only unify these varied groups with respect to a single objective: lobbying for federal funds and legislation. In the present climate of the field, however, a coalition like the JNCL cannot undertake to link its constituents together in matters relating to their teaching, teaching, research, or educational policies without infringing on the territorial sovereignty of the individual organizations. The day may come, of course, when the members of the JNCL, or some similar coalition, reach the conclusion that their common interest, need, and mandate are strong enough to transcend their special interests. Indeed, their situation may eventually come to resemble that of the thirteen original colonies, which, overcoming the differences that had separated them in the past, created a unity for the future. No incentive is ever as strong as the existence of a common enemy and a common emergency.

For the language-teaching profession, the "common enemy" -- monolingualism and educational inequity -- can again help create the conditions necessary for reaching consensus on basic educational philosophy and mission. The starting point for a statement of mission, I believe, could be a simple affirmation that all those in the United States should have the opportunity to acquire functional competence in two languages, English and another. Going beyond this simple premise, I would propose the text of the Resolutions on Language in American Education issued by the Joint National Committee on Languages on October 7, 1978 become the focus of discussions aiming at consensus on a statement of mission. I offer the following amended text, revised to accommodate current thinking about proficiency-based instruction, language awareness, relationships between bilingual education and foreign language education, and the changing federal role in education:

> Believing that all those in the United States should have the opportunity, either in school or college or as adult learners, to acquire functional competence in English and in at least one other language, we urge support for the following resolutions:
>
> - The secondary schools of the United States should offer every student the opportunity to learn a widely used international language, in addition to English, by providing a full sequence for the study of language and culture. To develop existing language resources, the schools should offer students from non-English-speaking backgrounds the opportunity to study their home language.
>
> - In their study of English and of other languages, students should be guided to a better understanding of the nature, uses, and value of languages; the relationships between language and culture; the variety of human languages and cultures; and the concept of cultural parity.
>
> - Students wishing to acquire full proficiency in languages and international studies in secondary school should have access to district-wide or regional "magnet" schools that provide such instruction.
>
> - Institutions of higher education have a responsibility to provide instruction in less commonly taught languages and in area studies, in addition to widely used languages. Because training in such languages often serves

national public interests, existing federal support for instructional programs should be expanded.

- Institutions of higher education must ensure a supply of competent language teachers to meet needs at all levels of education, and must assist in creating programs to upgrade the skills of experienced teachers. Federal funds should be made available to help support this effort.

Notes

1. Despite its inappropriateness, the term "foreign language" is used here to refer to languages other than English, in recognition of the term's continued widespread use in traditional curricula, names of organizations, and similar contexts.

2. Recent efforts like the College Board's Project Equality and the U.S. Department of Education's National Commission on Excellence in Education aim to achieve something like a national consensus on priorities in general education.

IV. An Insomniac's Solution to the Problem of National Language Policy

Jack Levy
George Mason University

"I must follow the people. Am I not their leader?"
Benjamin Disraeli

Introduction

This paper rests upon a hypothesis which, to this author, is as compelling as it is impossible. I believe that the most powerful tactic that could promote a multilingual-oriented national language policy is not another task force of specialists or a presidential commission; it is not the passage of a federal law, or even fifty separate state laws; it is not the pronouncements of various professional organizations in language and international/intercultural relations; and it is not a massive research effort involving countless surveys, statistical treatments, and interpretations. These have all been tried, in one form or another, and have failed. Rather, the most powerful tactic to promote the development of a national language policy can only be the forced disappearance or removal of all specialists, spokespersons, and decisionmakers in the areas of bilingualism, foreign/second language study, and language policy. Toward that end, I would like to make the following suggestion: All people who are in any way bilingual, or who receive payment for services based on bilingual skills should go to sleep for one year.

What I am suggesting, therefore, is to take ourselves out of the language picture for a while and see what happens. Let's gamble. Let's take the risk that if we spend the next year in peaceful slumber we'll awake to find a country clamoring for our services. And if this doesn't happen? Well, then...the problem of national language policy would be solved.

I would now like to advance a more serious hypothesis. It appears that the issues that surround the adoption of a multilingual-oriented national language policy are reducible to questions of leadership. These concerns must be seen from the dual perspective of past tradition and present realities, not always an easy balance to strike. Further, many of the issues, despite much agitation, are

not controversial at all. They simply need to be brought forth in the correct manner, one which provides for the strongest possible political base. And, in recognition of current societal trends, this implies returning--not taking--the matter back to the people. It is my sincere belief that, with regard to the individual topic of national language policy, "bottom-up" leadership is essential.

Background

Since the problem of second language learning and national security became visible in the Sputnik era, a succession of task forces, commissions, studies, and laws have bombarded the U.S. people with the merits of bilingualism. The issue has been ground upon so often by so many "high-level" groups as to become toothless and bland. One wonders why a president's commission, an AED/Hazen Foundation conference, or a Modern Language Association task force (among many others) were created, if only to reiterate the obvious: for a host of reasons, multilingualism is preferable to monolingualism. It is doubtful whether many people in the United States, from the farmer in Iowa to the New York business executive, would disagree. Similarly, no one truly denies the proposition that every citizen should be functionally competent in English. These overblown "positions" are unquestionably moot.

What is definitely not moot, however, is the observation that these beliefs have been internalized within the national consciousness. Somehow, the message has not gotten through. While it is not overly productive to search for someone to blame, some fault must lie with second language teachers such as myself. To quote one of those despised national task forces:

> Despite profound social changes and despite the changing character of many of our educational institutions, the language teaching enterprise has maintained most of its basic structures and approaches during a time when enrollments, at the college level, have fallen by more than twenty percent....Traditionally, language faculty have assumed that the educational value of language study is self-evident, and that no effort is needed to justify its place in the curriculum either to their students or to a wider public. (MLA Task Force, 1978, pp.1-2)

Since we all recognize the basic problem as attitudinal, let us turn our attention to those whose attitudes must be changed, in order to convince them that, in Pei's words, "If you scoff at language study...how, save

in terms of language, will you scoff?"

Recommendations

1. Don't talk to members of Congress or anyone else "in power"--they probably aren't.

While a conventional view of leadership holds that those at the top are both creative and bold with new ideas, the current national feeling borders on the opposite. The U.S. people basically believe that folks in Washington (like us, unfortunately) have lost touch with populist notions. The last two presidents have been elected largely as a result of anti-federal government platforms. Anyone who's kept his or her ear to the ground must realize, then, that it's time to return this issue, if not many others, to Main Street.

The question will ultimately turn on support from "the field," as policymakers like to phrase it. Local entities such as PTAs, student organizations, community agencies, and business groups should be targeted. Unexpected assistance in the form of guidance might come from the activist literature produced by unions, social welfare agencies, and possibly even revolutionary causes (keep it peaceful, though!). Messages must be simple and highly practical (more on this below). Above all, we must constantly seek to instill a desire for bilingualism in the people who pay the taxes. It will thus be easier to subsequently extract a favorable national language policy from those who divide up the loot.

2. Whatever requirements still exist for foreign language study in public schools should be abolished immediately (assuming they were promulgated by curriculum councils, administrative teams, or other "pretenders").

We must sell ourselves, for coercion cannot succeed. I can remember teaching the required introductory Spanish courses to high school freshmen and sophomores. Every semester I would labor to overcome thedisadvantages of having those captive audiences. ("Captivate the captivated," my supervisor always said.) Unfortunately, I rarely succeeded, which is one reason why my students know nothing of the language today (other reasons are too painful to remember!). I would much have preferred to drop the requirement, and if my classes were not sufficiently enrolled, seek another line of work. Once again, requirements are valid if called for by the clientele--which, incidentally, includes other groups besides students. Requirements that "trickle down" from on high should always be questioned. Unfortunately, a great many of us need to makes ourselves needed.

3. The "What's in It for Me?" Paradigm.

This is the principal question which should constantly be asked of spokespeople for national language policies, second language study, and bilingualism. If we are earnest in our drive for multiple language development, then there must be evidence on a grand scale that demonstrates tangible advantages. As stated by one expert:

> The mainstream population needs to become acquainted with the economic rewards to be derived from bilingualism. Such information can be presented in terms of job opportunities offered to bilingual people by multinational corporations, foreign countries, and American governmental agencies. The enterprise-oriented mainstream American needs information which indisputably delivers the message that bilinguality can be a profitable complement to the entrepreneurial personality -- one which can provide benefits for everyone involved. (Levy, 1979, p.375)

Conclusion

One further question must be presented: If a multilingual-oriented national language policy were congressionally mandated tomorrow, what changes would come about? Not many, in my opinion. English would still remain the unofficial "official" national language. Students would still be free to learn other languages, though there might be a few more sweeteners for encouragement. Minor changes might be seen in the development of national standards, increased research efforts, expanded curricular offerings, and a rise in pupil enrollment. Some of the millions of dollars in appropriations would undoubtedly be frittered away by bureaucrats and academics seeking to re-invent the wheel. Once this huge monetary tour de force ended, however (as it surely would, given the cyclical nature of governmental priorities), the question of lasting impact would still remain.

It is far better to return to the source; far better to allow the policy to evolve; far better to plant the seed, nurture it, and then get out of the way. The U.S. people will never pervasively accept a multilingual national language policy until they accept multilingualism. And they might never accept that until we leave them alone.

Anyone for a nap?

References

Academy for Educational Development, and Edward W. Hazen Foundation. A New Direction for Bilingual Education in the 1980s. Focus No. 10 (March 1982). Rosslyn, Va.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1982.

Grant, Steven. "Language Policy in the United States." Paper commissioned by the Modern Language Association/American Council of Learned Societies Task Force on Government Relations, 1978.

Hubbard, John, and Ristau, R. "A Survey of Bilingual Employment Opportunities in International Trade." Foreign Language Annals 15, no. 2 (April 1982): 115-121.

Levy, Jack. "Pluralism's Child: Bilingual Education at the Crossroads." Cross-Reference 2, no. 6 (November-December 1979): 369-379.

"Report of the Task Force on Institutional Language Policy." Task force commissioned by the Modern Language Association/American Council of Learned Societies, 1978.

U.S., President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. Strength through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1979.

NOTE: Most--but not all--of the comments contained herein are made with tongue planted firmly in cheek.

V. Consolidating Mutual Strengths

Virginia da Mota
Rhode Island Department of Education

Bilingual education and foreign language studies are two disciplines that are pedagogically very much interrelated, and yet they have never capitalized on the potential inherent in cooperative approaches to mutual program development. One of the reasons for this unfortunate occurrence is the fact that bilingual education in the United States has been perceived in a minority context while foreign language studies have been perceived as being for the elite. These perceptions, along with the overwhelming negative public sentiment against bilingual education, have mitigated against joint efforts. Further, there is an ambivalence on the part of many people toward learning another language, a factor that has contributed to keeping these two disciplines apart. The fact of the matter remains that both disciplines have one very basic goal in common: the development of full competency in a language.

I think the time has come for professionals to reexamine their respective roles and perhaps take on a new role that will revitalize the art of language instruction in schools. Foreign language teachers need not be threatened by bilingual teachers but rather should seek to encourage alliances with them. Foreign language instruction can benefit from the methodological advances and communication refinements in bilingual education. Similarly, bilingual educators can learn much regarding applied linguistic theory and the teaching of literature within a cultural context from contact with foreign language experts. These strengths can be consolidated to the benefit of all concerned.

What is needed is a united effort to seek the support not only of other academicians, but also of the business, labor, and media communities. The support of these other groups is vital for any change in education today. Businesses can benefit from a resurgence of foreign language study and cultural awareness because of their increased international and multinational investments. Tapping the potential market abroad necessitates a sensitivity toward the realities of the global business community.

The labor movement has long recognized the need to prepare for the demands of growing business interests. An increased number of positions for workers who are bilingual or speak a second language has made it attractive for labor to consider the merits of employees with foreign language skills.

The media also have much to gain from bilingual education and foreign language instruction. The embarrassing situation that former President Carter was confronted with when he visited Poland, the inability to assess accurately the conflicts within Iran, and the overwhelming misinterpretation of South American political activities should serve to remind us of how ignorant the media are -- not only of the languages but also of the cultures involved. Many language groups are improperly depicted by the media -- a matter of serious concern -- and with the increased use of cable television it is extremely important to remedy this situation. The media are guilty of sins of omission and commission, both of which help to misshape public policy. This lack of sensitivity or awareness is symptomatic of a much larger issue vis a vis the role of public attitude toward non-English languages in the United States.

Since my experience lies specifically with bilingual education, the focus of my presentation will be on that program. Before either bilingual education or foreign language instruction can gain momentum and public support, we need to develop a national policy that destigmatizes, clarifies, and ultimately promotes the use of languages other than English in the public schools.

First, we must determine who the major critics of bilingual education are and what, exactly, they are saying about it. Some of the critics contend that bilingual education is a program that benefits only the Hispanics and that it will eventually lead to separatism. There are others who argue that bilingual education is very costly and that it retards instruction in English. Others are simply concerned about their own job security and are fearful that they will be replaced by bilingual staff. And then there is the viewpoint that everyone in this universe should speak English, and so who really cares about learning another language?

Who are these critics? They are from all walks of life and some of them are even our colleagues in education.

Second, once we have determined who the critics are and what they are saying about the program, we should prepare to meet with them and engage them in an honest

discussion. We can try to understand why they have formulated a negative opinion and then proceed from there. Bilingual educators, like many others, are predisposed to involve themselves in forums and conferences where their views are already shared by the majority in attendance. We need to reach out to other groups and organizations to talk about the merits of bilingual education.

One of the drawbacks in this, however, is that there are far too many definitions for bilingual education, which in turn tends to confuse further those who are not familiar with educational terminology. We need to agree on a definition for bilingual education that encompasses our national reality and that is both concise and comprehensible to the general public; maybe a definition that stresses bilingualism in terms of full competency in English and another language. The specifics of program designs and descriptions of different instructional models can be left to educators, parents, and local policymakers.

If, in fact, such a definition were incorporated and given visibility at the national level, a major media campaign could then be waged focusing on this definition. I think we could then expect to see public opinion begin to respond.

Another effort should be to conduct a major outreach campaign to seek support of local, regional, and national labor and business groups. The campaign should inquire about their needs and determine exactly what bilingual education can offer them. Before approaching these organizations, it is imperative to familiarize ourselves with the company's international goals and markets and the language skills that they seek in their employees. In this way we can build a firm and solid association with the business sector. With decreased educational funding it is necessary to cultivate relationships with the business sector. All foreign language and bilingual teachers should be advocates and consequently lobby for recognition of the merits of their programs.

All of education is vital to our economy and our international position, but bilingual education and modern language instruction in particular can, jointly, provide a lasting impact on the future direction of the United States.

Although research has supported the validity and effectiveness of bilingual education, further research, as Rotberg (1982) states, should include: the language skills and training of teachers; the distribution of resources to target populations; the expected consequences of alternative federal policies, such as giving school districts more flexibility in instructional approaches; the

effects on student achievement of well-implemented programs and the characteristics of programs that are effective for particular students and communities; the description of effective programs for minority language children in integrated settings; and the identification of exemplary foreign language instructional techniques in the United States and other countries, both in elementary and secondary schools and in selected foreign language institutes and universities.

In summary, I would like to point out six recommendations made in the Hazen Foundation's report on bilingual education, which I feel suggest an appropriate course of action that we need to consider.

1. An overall shift in emphasis to a language-competent society.

2. A no-holds-barred insistence on full mastery of English as an essential aspect of "language competence" in United States society.

3. Correction of the remediation-inferiority image of bilingual instruction. Real competence in English and another language is fully achievable and must become the accepted goal of bilingual education for the program to be seen as a positive contribution to a language-competent United States.

4. Increased emphasis on parent-school system partnership. Parents should not have to rely on private schools as their only means of offering their children instruction for language competence. Attaining language proficiency demands hard work and commitment, but it is also fun and rewarding. Parental encouragement is important; and parents should be able to have confidence in the instructional method chosen.

5. More bilingual programs should be expanded to include English-dominant students. As bilingual instruction comes to be seen as a desirable choice for English-speaking families, the enrollment of English-speaking children will provide a resource to help those with limited English proficiency, just as the non-English speakers can be a resource for helping English speakers learn other languages.

6. Increased attention should be given to the economic advantages of multilanguage competence in view of our shrinking world and competition from nations that have developed greater language competence.

In this regard, I also think that the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education can play a very

important role not ony by keeping professionals current on research and other important kinds of information, but also in bridging the gap between business, bilingual, and modern language education. The Clearinghouse has access to a vast warehouse of information gathered by agencies throughout the world and this can be a tremendous resource for the business community. The linkage between the business community, bilingual education, and modern language instruction will be the key to the formulation of a national policy on languages.

On the local level, we can see this linkage operating at Brown University in Providence, Rhode Island, where the foreign languages and bilingual education programs emanate from the same center of teaching, research, and training. An array of resources--both human and financial--is assembled to provide diverse language services in a multipurpose context. This model clearly reflects what should be a trend, receiving national attention and replication.

It is through these kinds of local efforts, which can be cited in other parts of the country as well, that the real future of modern language instruction in the United States is envisioned. Any viable national policy must draw its life force from these examples.

References

Academy for Educational Development, and Edward W. Hazen Foundation. A New Direction for Bilingual Education in the 1980s. Focus No. 10 (March 1982). Rosslyn, Va.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1982.

Rotberg, Iris C. "Some Legal and Research Considerations in Establishing Federal Policy in Bilingual Education." Harvard Educational Review 52, no.2 (May 1982): 149-68.

U.S., President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. Strength through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1979.

VI. The Role of Language Study in Bilingual Education

James E. Alatis
Georgetown University

My paper focuses on the function of language studies within the framework of bilingual education. It aims at dispelling some of the misunderstandings that surround bilingual education programs. I have chosen this topic because I know that, despite our tireless efforts to educate the public about the facts of bilingualism, concerns over such issues as "separatism" or "linguistic imperialism" or "cultural aggressiveness" persist. If we want to explore "strategies for developing a cohesive national direction toward language education in the United States," the first step is to try to change public attitudes. We need to convince the U.S. people that the concerns just referred to are not well founded.

First, I must make clear my position as a committed language educator. I subscribe to a philosophy of language teaching that emphasizes the humanistic basis of the language profession. It defines the ultimate function of language study as an attempt "to achieve an understanding, as complete as possible, between people of different linguistic backgrounds" (Fries, 1955, p.10). I strongly support the notion that learning a second language is a "liberalizing" experience because it serves to free one from the shackles, the restraints, and the barriers imposed by such limitations as confinement to a single language. Indeed, I have always insisted that even the study of language <u>as language</u> is a humanistic study; that is, all the uses and manifestations of language and linguistic communication -- in all their philosophic, social, geographic, and ethnic splendor -- are the basis of a humanistic discipline.

Seen in this light, language study assumes a function that extends beyond academic objectives to social and international considerations. It can be charged with the task of contributing to the improvement of the human condition--indeed, even to the survival of humankind. This is no paltry slogan or vapid boast! The need for the humanistic function of language study can be understood only if we remind ourselves of the alarming nature of the cross-cultural problems which continue to abound both inside and outside the United States.

Let us first consider this point within the framework of our own society. Everyone is very well aware of the statistics and data concerning the entry of immigrants, refugees, and "undocumented aliens" to our shores. According to recent findings, a flood of immigrants is bringing well over one million newcomers a year into the United States--the highest level since the mass migration of Europeans at the turn of the century. By some estimates, El Salvador alone has generated as many as 500,000 U.S.-bound refugees since 1980. The United States today is accepting twice as many immigrants as all other nations combined. "If immigration is continued at a high level," warns Senator Alan Simpson, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Immigration, "and a substantial portion do not assimilate, they may create some of the same social and economic problems that exist in the countries from which they come" (U.S. News, 1982).

Nor is the international aspect of the situation any less alarming. If it is true that one out of eight manufacturing jobs in the United States is dependent on exports, and that one of every three acres of land is planted for agricultural export, then it is evident that our tie with other countries is not just an adjunct but an essential condition of our survival as an affluent society. Indeed, if we want to maintain our position of leadership in the world, we must make ourselves capable of responding effectively to the need for a spirit of kinship--of a common humanity--with other peoples. The only key to the achievement of this goal lies in strengthening our ability to communicate with other nations. If we fail to do this, we must be prepared to face the kind of consequence against which former U.N. Secretary General Kurt Waldheim warned us: "Many civilizations in history have collapsed at the very height of their achievement because they were unable to analyze their basic problems, to change direction and to adjust to the new situation which faced them" (Lurie, 1981).

Thus, nothing less than our survival as a great nation demands that we, as committed educators, should use our most powerful weapon--language--as effectively as we can to help create a sense of unity among people, which is an indispensable condition of peace and general prosperity. The national and international aspects of this "historical" appeal link language programs to bilingual education on the one hand, and to international studies on the other. All these disciplines are inseparable parts of one whole, and must be viewed as such if we are to accomplish a task of such crucial importance to humanity and to society. I intend to stress in this paper the interdependence of the fields of language and bilingual education.

First, I will explain this interdependence with regard to teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESOL). Indeed, the arguments of those who maintain that bilingual education serves only to develop the non-English skills of minority children are not well founded. Neither are the anxieties of those who believe that retention of minority languages may impose a threat to the national unity. I heartily and unequivocally support the notion expressed by Spolsky that "any bilingual education program in the United States must include an effective ESOL component, and any ESOL program that ignores the children's first language is likely to be ineffective" (Spolsky, 1970, p.327). I advocate a TESOL program that ensures full mastery of English as an essential aspect of U.S. citizenship.

For those who may accuse me of linguistic or cultural "imperialism," let me use the following analogy. An actor who appears on the stage, say, as Hamlet, does not feel that a foreign identity has been imposed upon him. Rather, he has every reason to be proud of having the thespian talent that enables him to switch roles. The actor's attempt to assume a dramatic role is the expression of a highly "conscious" and "meaningful" departure from his own personality. It is obvious that in order for him to succeed in his undertaking he must be able to maintain not only a clear insight into the nature of the dramatic persona, but also an acute awareness of his own identity. As soon as he forgets who he is, or the minute he overlooks the psychological features of the role he is playing, his dramatic performance will be impaired.

I suggest that our minority language groups in the United States face a similar situation. In order for non-English-speaking U.S. citizens or residents to enter the mainstream of U.S. life, they must be enabled to play an "American role." That is, they must learn to lend themselves to a cultural situation that requires a new extension of their identity. The key to their success in playing positive roles in the social and economic settings of U.S. society lies, above all, in developing full competence in the English language. It is our duty as teachers of English to speakers of other languages to provide them with this key. Indeed, it is our moral obligation to teach people English--otherwise we are engaging in an insidious kind of veiled discrimination that discourages the young national origin minority students from investing in education. By emphasizing the "humanistic" or, to use a fresh term, "integrative," function of language teaching, we can fulfill the students' need for acquiring mastery of English, as well as enhance their awareness of, and ultimately increase their empathy with, the role they must assume in order to appear on the public stage of U.S. life. And we can do this without

causing them to lose their own identities. For this purpose, we must place them in the hands of well-educated, i.e., humanistic-oriented teachers.

Such is the objective that makes TESOL an irreplaceable part of bilingualism. Indeed TESOL and bilingual education are so closely intertwined that some people consider the two fields to be synonymous. For example, Finocchiaro begins one of her articles in the TESOL Quarterly identifying what she considers to be the two desired terminal objectives of most TESOL courses -- bilingualism and biculturalism. Thus, to Finocchiaro and other leaders in the field of ESOL, bilingualism is the "terminal behavior" that ESOL teachers strive to produce in their students (Finocchiaro, 1971).

To repeat: The social mission of TESOL is to prepare non-English speakers in the United States for the public roles they have to play. But how can they appear in a new cultural shape if the base from which they must depart remains shaky and if they fail to recognize the value of their own parent cultures? It is here that te other inseparable arm of bilingual education, that is, native language instruction, can and must be effectively used to help.

It seems appropriate at this point to make a quick reference to Rodriguez, a writer of Mexican American origin whose recent book, Hunger of Memory, has been cited as evidence against the effectiveness of bilingual education programs. The ultimate conclusion Rodriguez reaches is, in fact, no different from the principle that motivates our emphasis on TESOL as an essential component of bilingual education. He, too, recognizes that learning English will permit non-English-speaking U.S. citizens or residents to acquire a public persona, which in turn will enable them to find access to the benefits of U.S. society. He objects to bilingualism, however, on the ground that helping minority students retain their native language delays assimilation. Whether retention of minority languages delays or speeds the acquisition of "the public language" is a technical question which Rodriguez should have left to the specialists to answer. And let those who tend to formulate a general principle on the basis of this author's isolated case be reminded of the significant fact that a majority of ESOL teachers have been, and still are, bilingual and bicultural individuals themselves.

The problem goes much deeper than this technical issue. It has been pointed out that all Rodriguez's writing to date is, curiously enough, "about who he was, what he had become, and how he had gotten there. In other words, about being a Mexican" (Madrid, 1982, p.7). This obsession, it seems to me, indicates that despite his

apparent integration into U.S. society, the question of self-identity for Rodriguez has continued to remain a deep concern. I can think of no other reason for this sense of uncertainty except that the cultural soil in which Rodriguez's identity is rooted has, for lack of enrichment, lost its necessary firmness, thus making him subject to a shaky condition of ethnic reality.

It is precisely this sense of cultural insecurity against which we try to protect our minority children; and bilingual education, we believe, is an effective attempt to achieve this goal. Indeed, by enabling the national origin minority children to retain their native language and cultural heritage, we can help them develop the feeling of security and self-esteem that is so badly needed for survival and for success in our highly competitive society. We can teach them to feel proud of the riches of their native culture, and enable them to switch cultural roles, as appropriate, to particular community needs.

I wish to stress the maintenance of the mother tongue in order to assure critics of linguistic diversity that teachers of English to speakers of other languages recognize the dual language and dual cultural basis of bilingualism. They have always held, as Robinett has told us, an "additive" rather than a "replacive" philosophy when they have taught standard English as a second language or second dialect (Robinett, 1972, p.204). That is, they have attempted to add a new register of language to a student's repertoire rather than eradicate or replace the register that he or she already possesses. And they have hoped to impart to their students the ability to switch codes instinctively, so as to use that language or that dialect which is most appropriate and which evokes the greatest amount of cooperation and least amount of resistance in a given situation.

To sum up: The ESL portion is an essential component of any good bilingual program. The mother tongue and culture are equally essential. Thus the kind of bilingualism we advocate leaves, I hope, no cause for concern over "separatism." Nor does it offer grounds for being accused of "linguistic imperialism" and "cultural aggressiveness." On the contrary, it entails an attitude toward language that is human, humane, and humanistic. Our objective is no less than helping millions of children throughout the United States to reach their full potential as citizens of our increasingly complex and troubled society.

To fulfill a mission of such importance is not, I admit, an easy task. It requires forceful--and creative--national leadership. For this purpose, we need cooperation and unity among professional organizations. If

the language profession is to acquire and maintain the intellectual strength and political power necessary in these times, a new concept of the professional, and a new concept of a unified professional entity, must be created. We must recognize that it is not enough to present programs designed to promote language studies. In order to be able to implement such programs, we must try to educate the general public about our profession and to sensitize policymakers to our needs. This cannot happen without cooperation and unity among professional organizations. Only those organizations that use their energies to produce a unified professional entity will ultimately receive the backing of the majority of teachers, of the U.S. people, and of the government that represents them. Thus the realization of our common goals depends upon our professional unity. If we fail to achieve it, we will fail to contribute to the solution of our most pressing national problems. My final recommendation, therefore, is that we should abandon our petty provincialisms--disciplinary tribalism--and strive for a unified professional entity. This is the only road to success in developing a national direction toward language education.

References

Finocchiaro, Mary. "Myth and Reality in TESOL: A Plea for a Broader View." TESOL Quarterly 5, no. 1 (March 1971): 3-17.

Fries, Charles C. "American Linguistics and the Teaching of English." Language Learning6, nos.1-2 (1955): 1-22.

Lurie, Joseph. "America...Globally Blind, Deaf and Dumb." Document made available at the AAC Conference on International Aspects of Undergraduate Education, Baltimore, Md., February 1981.

Madrid, Arturo. La Red/The Net 53 (April 1982): 6-9.

Robinett, Betty W. "The Domains of TESOL." TESOL Quarterly 6, no.3 (September 1972): 197-207.

Spolsky, Bernard. "TESOL." In The Brittanica Review of Foreign Language Education, vol. 2, edited by Dale Lange. Chicago: Encyclopedia Brittanica, 1970.

U.S. News and World Report (April 12, 1982): 47-50.